UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Trends in Present-Day Philosophy

By OLIVER L. REISER

Should India Have Freedom Without Delay?

By JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND

Church and State

By MAY STRANATHAN

Henri Barbusse

By H. W. L. DANA

VOLUME CXII

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bi-Weekly Until Further Notice

Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 10 cents

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter July 30, 1931, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 87
Jottings—J. H. H. 89

ARTICLES—

Trends in Present-Day Philosophy—OLIVER L. REISER 90
Should India Have Freedom Without Delay?
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND 92
Church and State—MAY STRANATHAN 94
Henri Barbusse—H. W. L. DANA 96

POETRY—

[illegible] Music in the Mills Again—GEORGIANA BOLE KING 87
[illegible] ANNE REILEY NESOM 93
[illegible] the Blood Atonement—
[illegible] 93
[illegible] 95
[illegible] 97

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

V. J. Patel, of India

The death of Mr. V. J. Patel removes from the Indian scene one of the most influential and picturesque of her leaders. Mr. Patel's association with the British government had been of long standing. Four successive Viceroys: Hardinge, Chelmsford, Irwin and Willingdon, found in him an astute statesman, a worthy opponent and a trusted colleague. It is no secret that Lord Irwin's successful Viceroyalty was due to his acceptance of Mr. Patel's suggestions and viewpoint.

Held in high esteem alike by the British government and by the All-India National Congress, Mr. Patel was intimate with neither. Temperamentally destined to live on the Olympian height of aloofness, he dreamed every moment of his life the impending Swaraj for India, the dawn of a free India.

Age and physical ailments made him seem irritable, but nothing—not even acute physical suffering—could daunt him. I remember how keenly anxious the entire Indian community in Greater New York became for his very life when Mr. Patel decided, against the orders of doctors, to make a trans-continental lecture tour. In American slang, Mr. Patel had "guts." Yes, a resolute determination to carry through a plan—that is what he stood for in the minds of Indian patriots and British opponents alike. In that respect he typifies the spirit of dedication that animates all the followers of Mahatma Gandhi.

No, Mr. Patel was not a strict votary of non-violence, as his younger brother Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel is. Indeed, it used to disturb me a great deal when, heralded as a Gandhi aide, he would in speaking before certain groups lean heavily toward impatience and violence.

Whatever may be the verdict of history regarding Mr. Patel's contributions to India's fight for freedom, he will always be remembered as a most competent President and Speaker of the Indian Legislative Assembly. The first Indian to oc[illegible] that post, he not infrequently [illegible]sed British government of[illegible]eticulously sticking to [illegible]les of procedure [illegible] upholding of [illegible] 99

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXII MONDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1933 Number 6

THERE'S MUSIC IN THE MILLS AGAIN

Oh, wheels that have been silent sing
The gladdest, maddest song,
There's glory in each upward swing,
Each harsh and clanging gong.

The thread that weaves, the grain that sifts,
The glass that flares to bowls,
The magic iron-claw that lifts,—
Oh, each is saving souls!

And never was the song so sweet
The sight so good to see,
As where returning workers meet
In mill and factory.

For idle men can only grieve
And brood on wrath and wrong,
But busy men can only give
Their grateful hearts to song.

Then let us praise the powers that be
For men who fight and win,—
A chorus of prosperity—
The wheels of commerce spin!

GEORGIANA BOLE KING.

The European situation is more dangerous than it has been at any time since the vast explosion of August, 1914. It is not probable that war will break out just now, as it was not probable that war would break out in 1914 until the Austrian arch-duke was slain. It is the possibility of some sudden and utterly unforeseeable accident of this type that makes the hazard of this present moment so terrible. Failing this, there is every likelihood that war will not come in Europe within the next few years, since all peoples are afraid of it, statesmen do not want it, and Hitler is not ready for it. But this simply duplicates the earlier European situation of 1910, which led so inevitably, as we can now see, to 1914. Every condition making for war — millions of armed men, stupendous engineering equipment, territorial disputes, nationalistic rivalries, racial hatreds, dynastic ambitions, economic struggles and competitions—every condition, we say, exists in a form more aggravated than at any previous time in modern history. And added to these facts is that appalling psychological temper which would welcome war, fearful as it is, as a kind of relief from the unbearable political and social tension which has prevailed ever since the Armistice. In the face of this crisis, it is high time that we de[illegible] cided what we are going to do if, or when, war [illegible] British Labor has declared that it will [illegible] will call a general strike—a magnif[illegible] Will the churches of England, a[illegible] the same? Now is the h[illegible] a program of pacifi[illegible] by point, when [illegible] they were [illegible] churches—and organized labor, too!—went all to pieces in 1914, and thus offered no resistance to Caesar. That tragedy must not happen again. So, with the next war well in sight, we call upon the churches to declare *now* what they propose to do.

One could rejoice unreservedly in the wide acclaim given to Mr. Roosevelt's decision to make terms with Soviet Russia for recognition, were it not for the sordid motives entering into contemporary public sentiment. There is no regret for the absurdity, no penitence for the injustice, of American policy to date. There is no whole-hearted, if belated, confession of the beneficent promise of Russia's great experiment in economic change. There is not even any pity for the millions of men and women who have been so heroically struggling, since the collapse of the Tsar's regime, to save themselves from destruction and death. The new motive at work to bring this transfor[illegible] of the American mind on this Ru[illegible] question is the same as the [illegible] grant independen[illegible] sordid [illegible]

something. An hypocrisy which is so disgusting, that the honest, straightforward, thoroughgoing opposition of the D. A. R.'s to recognition of any sort, seems to us like perfect virtue and utter wisdom in comparison! But this indictment of our politicians and people we would not carry over to the administration! Mr. Roosevelt is a shrewd man, and he is therefore not unaware of the economic advantages of recognition of the Soviet Republic. But fundamentally he is an enlightened man, who we believe would have taken this step had there been not a penny of profit to have been made from it. By one bold and manly stroke, he has put an end to the stupid policies of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, aided and abetted by the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and therewith scored one more great triumph for his rule.

Any set-back or misfortunes for the Roosevelt administration stir our sympathy, for we want to see a gallant attempt at recovery succeed. But there is one exception—the agricultural relief policy, which we denounced in these columns, at the very first instant, as the craziest measure which had ever been written into the history of the nation. We stated that it would not succeed, and should not succeed, since it was contrary to every dictate of common sense, reason, justice, and right. Now that it has failed completely and the farming regions are in revolt, we are not a particle surprised and not a particle sorry. The machine has collapsed, is scattered as so much debris all over the landscape; get rid of it, and begin over again, and in heaven's name enlist a little sanity in consideration of the problem! Elementary in the whole situation is the question not of production but of distribution. Yet the agricultural experts—*experts,* God save the mark! —have been thinking of nothing but production. Not being able to distribute farm products, on the basis of our present profit system, even in a country where millions of persons are starving, these experts actually had the effrontery to destroy the wheat and corn and cotton and pigs which glutted the markets. Which is [illegible] there were a stoppage of blood in the arteries, [illegible] Musinstead of clearing the circulation, de- [illegible] of the heart for a time, or [illegible] embarrassing sup- [illegible] could a [illegible]

of the millions in this country, and in China, and in India, who need it. And if it can't be done under the profit system, Mr. President, as we very much suspect, then — well, there are other ways not altogether unknown!

The situation of the Negro is becoming perilous. The national recovery program, for reasons entirely unforeseen by the President and his advisers, is working to ruin the colored people economically, and to push them down into a state of servitude against which any rebellion is treated with brutal violence by the whites. The trouble begins with the AAA, and its attempt to destroy surplus corps. The elimination of 40 per cent of the cotton acreage of the South means the eviction of hundreds of thousands of tenant farmers, mostly Negroes. For when the white landlord is offered good money by the government to plow under his crops and to remove the land from cultivation, it is "in almost every instance the acreage which he is now leasing to tenants or share-croppers," to quote the Selma (Ala.) *Times-Journal.* So the Negro farmers are ruined, while reports are borne to him, as he gazes upon his despoiled and idle furrows, that Argentina is about to double its cotton acreage, in order to compete with America at the anticipated higher prices. Then the NRA is competing with the AAA to undo the southern Negro. Thus, with the higher wages, Negroes are thrust out of employment in favor of whites, or else are forced to agree to accept wages lower than those provided for in the codes. If there is protest—well, consider the case of Rev. E. D. Hughes, colored Methodist minister of Selma, Alabama, who, refusing to sign a statement saying that he thought Negro workers should be willing to accept lower wages, was driven out of town by leading whites, including the chief of police, the secretary of the chamber of commerce, and the president of the bank. He escaped only by jumping from a speeding automobile and hiding in a ditch as the mob swept by. All this means a recrudescence of the lynching spirit, which means horror in the months to come. "We are in for very dark days," writes to us one of the best known and best informed Negro leaders in this country. Alas, how devious are the ways of progress!

Pacifism was never in greater peril than it is to- [illegible] As a cause, it seems to be crumbling under the [illegible] of events not dissimilar to those which ham- [illegible] submission in 1914. In that dreadful [illegible] German hosts of the Kaiser which [illegible] into the camps of violence [illegible] it is the hosts of Hitler [illegible] result. Yesterday, it [illegible] day it is Dr. [illegible] some one

else. Of the two groups of recanters—those of 1914, and those of 1933—we believe that the latter have infinitely the better case. If ever pacifists were justified in abandoning their faith, they are justified in this hour of Hitler's monstrous triumph. But we cannot interpret life in terms of the expediential principle that "circumstances alter cases." Faith, to our way of thinking, is not worth anything unless it is trusted at the moment when it seems to be most frail. Hitler is not an excuse for surrender, but an occasion for challenge. In him, and in no other, is the chance to *prove* the faith that is in us. But Hitler's army is not the only force now threatening to grind pacifism to pieces. A second and even more formidable attack comes from the direction of the class struggle, the effort of the workers to be free. Here we are told that power can alone be effective in the revolutionary movement against capitalism, and that the use of such power (force and violence) for such an end will be justifiable. Of the pacifists who have "caved in" on this front, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr is the most conspicuous as he is the most influential. It is amusing, and also illuminating, to notice that these "weak sisters" who are abandoning their pacifism in the face of the class struggle are doing it because of its radiant promise, whereas those who are abandoning their pacifism in the face of Hitler are doing it because of its darksome threat. In the one case they run into the arms of violence because the new force in the field—the Nazis—is so terrible and must be destroyed; and, in the other, because the new force—the proletariat—is so beautiful and must be helped. Evidently any excuse does for one who has no stomach to see things through.

The favorable action of the Universalists, in their recent convention at Worcester, Massachusetts, has assured the establishment in due course of the Free Church of America. Adopted by the Unitarians at their annual meeting last May, this project now unites the two outstanding liberal communions of the country, and opens the door, for union with them, to all liberal religious groups which are now alone. It is true that the Universalists asked for amendment of the preamble of the constitution, in the interest of a more definite pronouncement of spiritual faith. They also recommended a change of name. But these are points which cannot cause serious difficulty. The sorest division in the liberal religious world is now ended, and the scandal of sectarianism among free spirits laid, we believe, forever. We congratulate our Unitarian and Universalist brethren on this great and significant achievement. Also, we plead with all liberals everywhere to join the fellowship thus hospitably offered. No longer is there any reason, or excuse, for any group longer to flock alone. As it is a disgrace for any orthodox body to stay outside the ample borders of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, so we believe it will be a disgrace for any liberal or modernist group to stay outside this newly organized Free Church of America. The Community Churches will of course join—the New York and Boston institutions leading the way. The Ethical Culturists should welcome a fellowship as stoutly ethical in principle as it is spiritual in ideal. We should think the Hicksite Quakers would come along—perhaps all the Quakers, since their own historic breach is so definitely healed. With the Humanists it will be a matter of honor to enter in. The New Thought groups? Yes, by all means! And the Congregationalists—why can they not belong to this new body as well as to the old Federal Council, and thus stretch a bridge between the two? This Free Church is a great affair. It gives us new hope for religion in America.

Jottings

It seems to us a touching thing—has it a mystic significance?—that the last words of John Galsworthy's last book, "One More River," should be these:

> "And so, my most dear, here
> endeth the tale! Good-night."

The administration has informed an anxious country that it will not turn to paper-money inflation "except as a last resort." A last resort to what? *Ruin?*

Dr. J. I. J. Hurst, of Cambridge University, declares that "brains are dying out." They certainly are! It needs no scientific authority to tell us this. Look at the world!

It is now demanded that buying under the NRA codes be made "mandatory." This sounds like "forcible feeding" for an entire nation.

Judge Robert F. Duer, of Maryland, says that he "was badly mistaken in judgment" in the case of the recent horrible lynching in that dishonored state, and that he is "deeply grieved." Very comforting, surely, for the young negro whose body was beaten, bruised, cut, stamped upon, hanged, and burned!

What becomes of cabinet officials after they retire? The complete and perfect way in which most of them disappear makes us wonder what is the reason they were ever asked to appear.

J. H. H.

Trends in Present-Day Philosophy*

My purpose in the present paper is to set forth the manner in which contemporary philosophy and religion are influencing each other. We say "each other" advisedly, since it has always been true that the two interact and thereby modify each other. Sometimes the preponderance of causal influence lies on the side of religion, as in the middle ages, when theology was the "queen of the sciences" and philosophy was her "handmaid," and sometimes on the side of philosophy, as in modern times, when rationalistic philosophy serves in a measure to humanize religion. No doubt this interaction will continue as long as the two exist side by side as phases of our cultural pattern. If one or the other should ever disappear, which it will be that survives I shall not attempt to predict.

Modern philosophy is a complex thing: there are many points of view, and some of these are not directly related to the concepts and purposes of religion. Thus symbolic logic, one of the most vital and important developments in contemporary philosophy, appears to be compatible with several different types of metaphysics—Platonic realism or behaviorism, for example—and therefore has no great significance for our present purposes. And so in this way our discussion is considerably limited.

Since it is necessary to be brief, let me state at once that it is my belief that modern tendencies in philosophy (the active Thomistic movement in Catholic theology alone excluded) are definitely opposed to all forms of orthodox theology. Religious dogma finds no support in contemporary philosophical movements. It is true that idealism as a philosophy has always adapted itself to a religious interpretation of the world, but it is one thing to allow the theologian to equate "God" with the philsophical "Absolute," and quite another to allow him to deduce from this the truth of the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Bible, virgin birth, transubstantiation, or even the immortality of the soul.

With a historical background of two thousand years of theological apologetics serving to warn him of the intellectual dangers of such system making, the philosopher must inevitably have his religious inhibitions. Philosophers, for example, can never forget the service of Spinoza, who pointed out the objectionable features of our anthropomorphisms in religion. Then, too, when theologians confront the philosopher with some supposed proof for the existence of God they recall the thesis of Kant that religion is a matter of faith (or of the "practical" reason, as opposed to "pure" reason), and not of logical demonstration. And thus it comes about that when, for instance, Professor R. A. Millikan finds some support for theistic conclusions in his investigations of cosmic rays we find the philosopher, Max Otto, calling the attention of the physicist to this "forgotten service" of Kant. And when an Eddington or a Jeans wanders from his field of "pointer readings" into the metaphysical hinterlands, philosophers are not surprised to find another of their profession, in the person of Morris R. Cohen, stating that much as he respects these men as scientists, he is not much impressed by the results of their speculative excursions. Nor are many philosophers highly enthusiastic about the proposal of a Compton to find in Heisenberg's famous "principle of indeterminacy" an excuse for the reintroduction into psychology of the concept of "freedom of the will." And so we see that the philospher has built up a "sales resistance" to certain forms of religious propaganda.

And yet there are philosophers who are willing to take their turn at theistic universe building, provided they can do it with their own tools, according to their own blue prints. Plato, we recall, had his heaven, and Aristotle his Form of Forms. Even the modern pragmatist may have his limited deity, while Bertrand Russell has his moments devoted to the mystical worship of logical atoms. It is true that philosophical religions usually do not take the world by storm. If one goes through the complete list of such philosophical religions the reasons for their lack of convert-winning power are plain. I submit the following characteristics as requirements of a philosopher's religion: (1) it will not be easy to understand; (2) it will not be anthropomorphic; (3) all forms of supernaturalism will be condemned; (4) it will not possess much emotional or worship value, and (5) it will not win many adherents.

All these characteristics appear when we consider the one philosophic movement we have time to present which has implications for religion. I refer here to the much discussed doctrine of emergent evolution. The reason for the popularity of this movement is that modern speculative thought found itself in a blind alley: philosophy had degenerated into the give and take of refutations and counter-refutations between mechanists and vitalists, materialists and idealists, etc. The emergent evolutionists attempt to escape the horns of such dilemmas by adopting a new position—and thus a fresh breath of air sweeps through the otherwise stale corridors of philosophy.

And now let us get the more general outlines of the theory before us.

The term *emergent evolution* is a name for the process whereby *new* effects ("things" and "processes") arise in nature in an historical order from the operation of antecedent causes. These new wholes (or *"gestalten"*) contain or exhibit novel properties, different from what one would get by a summation of the properties of the constituent parts. That is to say, nature does not always respect human arithmetic: two plus two does not always equal four! In the case of such non-additive wholes the parts interact dynamically, and there is an internal relatedness of parts, rather than an external relatedness. In a human being, for example, the "unity of personality" is something other than the sum of the various reflexes and habits into which our behavior may be analytically split up. The situation here is quite different from the arrangement (external relatedness) of the pieces of furniture in a room, where individual parts may be added to, or taken away, without disturbing the remainder. In an emergent whole the entire configuration acts as a unit: such phenomena as are illustrated by the behavior of water—with its "wetness," surface tension, ability to quench thirst, put out fire, ability to accelerate chemical reactions, etc.—can not be deduced from a knowledge of the properties of oxygen

*The author, Dr. Oliver L. Reiser, is associate professor of philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh. He is the author of the book "Humanistic Logic," and the brochure, "Humanism and New World Ideals," the latter, just issued, containing also the full text of the "Humanist Manifesto."

Dr. Reiser is now cooperating in the ambitious project undertaken by the International Non-Aristotelian Library, edited by Count Alfred Korzybski.—Editor.

and hydrogen in isolation. This view stands in opposition to the mechanistic position of Laplace, when he declared that an infinite calculator could predict the entire future of the universe. Historically new and logically unpredictable things do happen, says the modern opponent of Solomon and Laplace.

What emerges in such cases is a *unitary mode of behavior*. The doctrine of emergent evolution thus places a greater emphasis upon the notion of *behavior* and a lesser emphasis upon the notion of *substance* ("matter") than the older theories permitted. On the emergent theory any entity, living or non-living, is a functional synthesis, a dynamic unity; whether it be a molecule or an organism, it is a behavioral unit, with its component rhythms of activity. Even the ultimate constituents of "matter" are functional units, according to the doctrine of *wave mechanics*. Thus in the new undulatory theory of the electron of de Broglio and Schroedinger old fashioned materialism is definitely discarded. In the same way, *life* and *mind* must be interpreted, not as entities, but as names for characteristic modes of action of "behavior-stuffs" of different degrees of complexity of organization. Man does not possess a soul, in the older sense; he *is* a soul, if you wish, in that he functions normally as a dynamic synthesis, a behavioral unity of integrated levels of action. This synthesis represents something new in nature, and man is "free" in the sense that the laws of the behavior of human beings are different from the laws of behavior of the chemical elements of which human beings are constituted.

This is a very sketchy outline of the doctrine of emergent evolution. The point of view has wide appeal, and we find such philosophers as E. G. Spaulding, R. W. Sellars, Lloyd Morgan, S. Alexander, G. P. Conger, A. N. Whitehead, and G. H. Mead subscribing to its main tenets. Among scientists it has attracted to its ranks such biologists as W. M. Wheeler, H. S. Jennings, the *gestalt* psychologists, and many others. We can not consider the various individual interpretations placed upon this doctrine by its several expositors. We have time here to glance at but one version of it, namely, that presented by Dr. A. N. Whitehead, the British mathematician and philosopher, who is now teaching at Harvard university. We select this view because Professor Whitehead gives us in his philosophy what many thinkers of a few years back had declared to be impossible in the modern world—a truly comprehensive *system* of philosophy.

We may begin our brief and necessarily inadequate presentation by pointing out that Professor Whitehead is much impressed by what he calls the "creative advance of nature"—a process pervading the whole of physical reality, in which things (or rather "events," in a relativistic universe) come into existence that never were before. For Whitehead the world is *process*—a striving, an appetition towards further creativity. The temporal world is a passage into novelty. Being incomplete, the cosmos strives for further completeness through its "concretions" into actuality. Here Dr. Whitehead's ideas are reminiscent of Aristotle, since for both reality is the process whereby the potential, the infinite realm of latent possibilities, emerges into actuality. Thus the actual acquires its definiteness through the transmutation of the indeterminate into determinate actuality.

These two poles of nature, the *actual* and the *potential*, give us the clue to, and the analogy for, the relation of the *physical* and the *mental*. That is to say, the physical pole of nature is that by which the actual deals with what is factual, while the mental pole is that by which the actual deals with the potential, the realm of possibilities. In brief, nature is a purposive process moving onward towards achievement. God is the principle in virtue of which the universe is what it is, as compared with what it might be. God is the principle of concretion; He enters into every creative phase of the process, and yet is somehow above change, as the realm of potential forms.

And there you have the skeleton of one of the most profound and intricate systems of metaphysics the world has ever known!

Considering the doctrine of emergent evolution as a whole, and ignoring minor differences of detail, let us sum up briefly the possible significance of the movement.

It is clear that on the side of theory there is no question of the importance of these views. The rise of the doctrine of emergent evolution and the present interest in *gestalt* psychology (of Max Wertheimer, W. Köhler, and K. Koffka) are illustrations of the change in attitude among scientists; they are symptoms of revolt against the dreary materialisms and arid mechanistic theories which have managed to live on into the era of modern philosophy. Now these intellectual fossils are being put where they belong—in the archæological museum of cultural evolution. Eventually, of course, this change in outlook concerning what "matter," "life," and "mind" are will reflect itself in a change in popular beliefs and practices. Perhaps for the layman of today the foregoing interpretation contains little that will give guidance and consolation. For a person holding to traditional religious dogmas a doctrine which substitutes what Dr. Whitehead calls "objective immortality" for the old belief in personal immortality will hold out no emotional appeal. But few of us who are familiar with the actual evolution of religions expect the conventional religious temper and viewpoint to endure forever, and in a new day the ideas of the emergent evolutionists may take on a wider and a deeper appeal. In that day it may then be truly said that religion has been "humanized."

OLIVER L. REISER.

"You want to know what was the most awful thing? The disillusionment was the most awful thing —the going off. The war wasn't. The war is what it has to be. Did it surprise you to find out that war is horrible? The only surprising thing was the going off. To find out that the women are horrible—that was the surprising thing. That they can smile and throw roses, that they can give up their men, their children, the boys they have put to bed a thousand times and pulled the covers over a thousand times, and petted and brought up to be men. That was the surprise! That they gave us up—that they sent us! The women sent us. No general could have made us go if the women hadn't allowed us to be stacked on the trains, if they had screamed that they would never look at us again if we turned into murderers."—Wounded Lieutenant, in *Men in War*, by Andreas Latzko (copyright, Boni & Liveright).

Should India Have Freedom Without Delay?*

In this enlightened Twentieth Century, ought any nation in the world to be in bondage? to have the rule of a foreign nation forced upon it? to be held in subjection to a foreign power by foreign bayonets?

If some nation possessing more modern arms and a larger army than England, or France, or Italy, or Germany, or the United States, should conquer, disarm and reduce to subjection any of these nations, would not the whole world be shocked by the monstrous wrong? But is holding India in forced subjection a lesser wrong? Has any one of these nations a greater right to freedom and self-government than has India?

What is India? Is it a small and insignificant nation? It is the second largest nation in the world, containing a population greater than North America, Central America and South America all combined. Think of all the Americans as held in forced bondage, then you have something like the bondage of India.

Is India a nation of semi-barbarians? On the contrary, India is a highly civilized nation—a nation which developed a rich culture much earlier than any nation of Europe and has never lost it.

India was the richest nation in the world until conquered and robbed of its wealth by Great Britain.

India is a nation a large part of whose people are Aryans in blood, that is, belong to the same great race as the Greeks, Romans, Germans, English and ourselves.

India early created the beginnings of nearly all the Sciences, some of which she carried forward to remarkable degrees of development, thus leading the world. Today, notwithstanding her subject condition, she possesses scientists of great eminence.

India has created, and today possesses, architecture equal to the finest produced by Greece—as witness the Pearl Mosque, the Kutab Minar, the Royal Palace of Delhi, and the Taj Mahal of Agra.

India has produced great literature, great arts, great philosophical systems, great religions, and great men in every department of life,—rulers, statesmen, financiers, scholars, poets, generals, colonizers, shipbuilders, skilled artisans, and craftsmen of every kind, agriculturists, industrial organizers, and leaders in far-reaching trade and commerce by land and sea.

For twenty-five hundred years India was pre-eminently the intellectual and spiritual teacher of Asia, which means of half the human race.

For twenty-five hundred years before the British came on the scene, and robbed her of her freedom, India was self-ruling, and one of the most renowned nations of the world.

Such is India. Should such a nation be held in bondage? Has not such a nation a right to liberty, to self-government, and to a place once more, such as she occupied so long, among the great nations of mankind?

The world should know that the people of India feel the degradation and injustice of bondage exactly as Englishmen and Americans would do; and they claim as much right to freedom as do Americans or Englishmen.

The world ought also to know that the people of India would not remain a day under a foreign yoke were it not that they are disarmed, that forts and soldiers are at every strategic point ready for instant action, that hundreds of airplanes are ready to drop deadly bombs or poison gas on their villages, and that battleships are in all their harbors ready to raze to the ground their cities, at the first sign of revolt.

Does this mean that the Indian people are a nation of weaklings and cowards? Let the British officers and soldiers who have witnessed their valor on a hundred battlefields answer.

India is under foreign rule today only because at a time of unusual political confusion and division, when the Mogul Empire was breaking up, Great Britain, with superior arms and with a persistent duplicity, which no reputable historian has dared to defend, conquered her territory, part by part, and disarmed her people; and has ever since determinedly prevented them from developing any independent military strength. Hence India's bondage, and consequent humiliation and degradation.

As late as the year 1863, America was guilty of holding in bondage three millions of human beings. We look back upon it with shame. Today, in India, after a century and a half of British rule, three hundred and fifty millions of human beings are held in bondage, one hundred millions of whom are actually worse housed, worse clothed, and worse fed, than the slaves of America ever were.

Mr. Lajpat Rai, an eminent Indian educator and a public leader, said in an address in London: "There are men who ask the people of India, Why are you not satisfied? What do you want? India answers: That you can ask such a question is staggering. What do we want? Are we not *men* as well as you? What would *you* want if, like us, *you* were held in subjection by the sword of a foreign power; if *you* were dominated industrially by foreign capitalists; if *you* were exploited financially by money-lenders of another land; if *you* were intellectually starved by rulers who deprived you of schools, and who shaped even the meagre education you were permitted to have in such a manner as to crowd out and belittle your own history, literature and culture, and substitute a foreign and far more materialistic civilization in its place; if *you* were domineered over by men who worshipped money and power and who were unable even to understand the higher intellectual, moral and spiritual ideals of your nation and race? Under such conditions, what would *you* want?"

Great Britain declares to the world that the Indian people are not fit to rule themselves, are not capable of self-government; that is the reason she is in India; it is her duty. She must rule there because they are not able to rule themselves.

Does anyone doubt the ability of England, or France, or Russia, or Japan to govern itself? Then why India, whose civilization is far older than that of any of these nations?

Who is it that presumes to say that the Indian people are not capable of self-government? Is it the Indian people themselves? No. They declare the contrary. They say that they have proved by more than three thousand years of history their eminent ability to rule themselves.

Who is it, then, that presumes to declare anything so improbable, so unreasonable, so contrary to

*Address given at the World's Fellowship of Faith, Chicago, September 17, 1933.

the whole experience of mankind, as that a great, historic, civilized nation, compared with which all the nations of Europe are *parvenus,* is incapable of self-rule, and needs to be governed by strangers coming from the other side of the world?

Let an Englishman answer the question. Some years ago, the Reverend Doctor John Page Hopps, an eminent clergyman of London, published an article in *The Modern Review* of Calcutta, answering the inquiry in a way that nobody has ever been able to refute. Wrote Mr. Hopps:

> Who says the people of India are not fit for home rule? We, Englishmen, who profit by ruling them; we, who do not want to surrender power; we, who in our egotism think we are the best and ablest rulers in the world. But it is an old cry. It was raised against the middle class in our own England; it was raised against the mechanics of our great towns; it was raised against our country farmers; it has been raised against our women; and in every case it has been raised, not for reasons of justice, but by the people in possession of power, who did not want to lose their power.

The nation which declares the Indian people unfit to rule themselves is the one among all the nations of the world which is least capable of judging fairly and justly in the matter, because, as Mr. Hopps points out, it is a deeply interested party. It is the nation which, some two centuries ago, not by right, but by force of arms, and for selfish ends, conquered the Indian people, and ever since has been holding them in subjection, because thus she secured and continues to possess increased political power and prestige in the world, large commercial and industrial advantage, much financial profit, and high and lucrative official positions, with fat pensions, for her sons. It is this nation that tells the world that the Indian people are incapable of ruling themselves. But, pray, what else can she be expected to tell the world? How else can she justify herself for staying in India?

When the liberty lovers in the world protest against the monstrous wrong of holding great India in bondage, the British Government tries to ease its conscience and meet the protest by saying: We are preparing the Indian people for freedom. We are training them to rule themselves; and sometime, we do not think it wise to fix any set time, but sometime, in some dim future when we get them properly educated for it, we purpose generously to grant them self-rule. But what does sometime mean? If I owe you a thousand dollars and give you my promissory note to pay you that thousand dollars sometime, with no date fixed, but only when I shall think it best for you to have it, my note, my promise to pay, is not worth the paper it is written on. No bank on earth will pay me one cent on it. Then what is the value of Britain's word that she proposes to grant India freedom sometime, with no time fixed? It is worth absolutely nothing.

Why is there this delay in granting to India the freedom and self-rule which is her right, and which she is so eminently fitted for? If an additional period of forced subjection such as Britain insists upon would improve the Indian people, or make them in any way more fit for self-rule, there might be some excuse for the delay. But how can prolongation of bondage, with its humiliating and degrading influence, and with the irritation and feeling of injury, hostility and antagonism which it creates, fit men better for self-government? Gladstone, England's great statesman, long ago declared:

> Every year and every month that a subject people are kept under the administration of a despotic government, renders them less fit for free institutions.

If such a delay would make a transference of the Indian government to the Indian people more willing or more easy on the part of Britain, that might do something to justify it. But how can postponement make Britain more willing, or the transference easier? There seems reason to believe that the effect is, and must always be, the exact opposite. Every year of delay increases British investments in India, and other entanglements between the two countries, which, of course, tends to make separation more difficult. Every year increases the public debt which Britain is piling on India, and through this strengthens her grip, since cost of the debt is owed to Britain. Of course, the stronger her grip, the less willing she is, and will always be, to let go. So that these delays, instead of being paths to India's self-rule, seem to be actual obstacles in the way of her attaining it within any visible time, if ever.

India feels indignant that such postponements are imposed on her. Is she not a great civilized, historic nation, that has ruled herself in the past for two or three thousand years, occupying a place of honor and influence in the world second to that of no other nation? Cannot such a nation rule itself now? If not, why not? Has a hundred and seventy years of British rule caused such deterioration and degeneration in her that she cannot do again what she did for so long a period with distinguished success?

If such has been the terrible effect of British rule, how much longer ought it to continue? Can its continuance do anything else than inflict on India still further degradation? Dare any reasonable man declare that it ought to continue a single day longer than it is necessary to turn over the country to its own great people?

JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND.

Gandhi Speaks

Can no redress be found
For wrongs that keep the Hindu bound?
My life I'd gladly give
If souls might live
In woman, child, and man
Who now endure this cruel ban;
Why should I value breath?
Their life is death.
I daily share their curse;
My voluntary pain is worse
Than theirs whom I would save.
Welcome the grave!
If Nirvana ends my fast
Friends will redeem the poor outcast.

ANNE REILEY NESOM.

Lines to Fundamentalists on the Blood Atonement

The gallant blood he calmly shed
By spear and spike and rod,
You counterfeit to coins of red
To bribe a bargaining god.

The rebel martyr Jesus Christ,
You make a substitute
For animals once sacrificed—
A dull and placid brute.

And thus his words of strength and love
Your every action mocks
As meaningless—mere bellows of
A sacrificial ox!

KENNETH W. PORTER

Church and State

In the light of history with its "religious" wars, a person with the temerity to advocate a union of church and state can expect to bring down upon himself a storm of denunciation. But since there are two sides to every question there are two sides to this one, and if we turn to what is to us the reverse side and study it, we may find there proof that the separation of religion and civil government has resulted in confused thinking and disastrous action.

The ancient Hebrews knew nothing of such a separation. To them the church and state were one, and not only the ten commandments were given them as the direct words of Jehovah, but also elaborate directions for sacrifices for their sins, for their conduct toward each other, the strangers within their gates and the heathen without, rules of hygiene, the details of the making and furnishing of the Ark of the Covenant, and other details which have long proved a stumbling block to those ambitious to read the Bible from cover to cover. But this was in the time of the "old dispensation" before the reputed head of modern Christianity had simplified religion to unselfishness and right living —visiting the widow and orphan in their affliction and keeping unspotted from the world. It was also before those who profess to be his followers had twisted and elaborated his words into many creeds and systems and made necessary the division of church and state as the only means of making safe the life and liberty of those not holding the same religion as those in control of the state.

So completely did we separate the two here in America that it has not been many years since the preacher who discussed "political" questions in the pulpit was sharply criticised as butting into matters which were no concern of his but should be left to "practical" men, while he occupied himself with "spiritual" things. Now we are learning the hard lesson that morals and politics cannot be successfully separated, that the spirit has no power to reform the world except through the material, that we cannot conceive of one without the other, and that, as Emerson puts it, what the world exists to realize is the transformation of moral genius into practical power. No philosopher nor any scientist, nor even any mystic—whatever a mystic is—has succeeded in divorcing the spiritual from the material. When the spiritualist thinks he has done so, he still must use the organs of speech to impart his theory to the world, and the fact that by emitting certain sounds we can tell our inmost thoughts, is as mystical as anything we are able to communicate.

Many books have appeared in America in recent years bearing on the application of ethics to government. In "The Church and the Present," Dr. Leighton Parks, former rector of St. Bartholomew's church, New York City, maintains that not only the need of education in character, divorce, and industrial problems are moral questions, but also the tariff. To these subjects we might add all questions bearing on our relations not only to our fellow citizens, but to the citizens of the whole world. Such questions are pressing harder for solution today than ever before, or so it seems in these critical times. We used to hear the slogan, "Take the schools out of politics," or similar slogans bearing on some other subject whose abuse had made it appear to our short-sightedness as bearing most directly on our homes or public well being. Even those opposed to suffrage for women used to sometimes concede that a voice might safely be allowed woman in matters of direct interest to the home or the child. When shall we outgrow this partial view and look at the entire circle of the state and see that the government is made entirely for and by the people and not the people for the government and that no phase of it is foreign to the general welfare? When shall we learn that politics must be a matter of ethics, of eternal expediency instead of a temporary makeshift?

In the introduction to his translation of Plato's "Republic," Dr. Jowett says: "Plato, laboring under what to modern readers appears to be a confusion of ideas, assimilates the state to the individual, and fails to distinguish ethics from politics." That it is so is Plato's glory and his immortality, as it is the glory and the immortality of Moses, despite the flaws we may be able to pick in them both. And it is the shame of the nations which call themselves Christians that they have so far divided the two; that the one has for so long drawn its skirts away from the touch of the other and has passed by on the other side, not recognizing himself in his fallen brother. So low has this division of morals and politics, of religion and state, brought us that the very words, "politics," and "diplomacy" have come to mean deceit and dishonesty and double dealing.

The crying need of the world today is not a city in the heavens, but a heavenly city on the earth. No city can be that which is founded on anything less than reason and justice. And who can maintain there is any of either in our politics? All the extravagance of statement, the promises like sounding brass and tinkling cymbal, the criminal waste of money in a time of sore need, all the ballyhoo of our elections from that of President and Congressmen down to the petty factional farces of local elections—all are "wind and fury, signifying nothing." Contrast our Government, —the like of whose greatness the world has never seen before, as we used to be told by our Fourth of July orators—contrast it with the picture of Plato's "Republic" whose legislators served without pay and were eligible for office only after many years of special training for the job—years of study followed by years of practical experience in affairs of state.

Will Durant defines ethics as the study of ideal conduct, and politics as the study of ideal social organization, "and not as one might suppose, the art of capturing and keeping office." But we have left ethics to religion, and religion has descended from the table lands of reason and justice into the dark ravines of strife-breeding creeds and ceremonies. Our plight is like that of George Fox, the founder of Quakerism. Macaulay, the historian, tells how as a young man, Fox wandered from congregation to congregation of Puritans, Catholics, Dissenters, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists and Independents, all striving in every corner of the realm for mastery, and refuting and reviling each other. Finding no help in any of these he concluded that no human being was competent to instruct him in divine things and that the truth had been communicated to him direct from heaven.

Commenting on the fact that men of ability and attainments became followers of Fox, whose intellect

he describes as being "in the most unhappy of all states, too disordered for liberty, and not sufficiently disordered for Bedlam," Macaulay says:

> Touching God and his ways with man the highest human faculty can discover little more than the meanest. In theology the interval is small indeed between Aristotle and a child, between Archimedes and a painted savage. It is not strange, therefore, that wise men, weary of investigation, tormented by uncertainty, longing to believe something and yet seeing objections to everything, should submit themselves absolutely to teachers who, with firm and undoubting faith, lay claim to a supernatural commission. Thus we frequently see inquisitive and restless spirits take refuge from their skepticism in the bosom of a church which pretends to infallibility, and after questioning the existence of a deity, bring themselves to worship a wafer.

Let us hope that the church of the future will have a foundation so simple, so plain and so firm that it can be fostered without separation from the state. Evident to all men are the axioms that justice is just and reason is reasonable. All men recognize that there is such a thing as a moral sentiment; such ideals in the human soul as reason and justice. Whether these things are known to us as absolute truth—*a priori*—communicated direct from the oversoul, or whether they are gradual development from the driving force of the material world, they are axioms as unchangeable as the fact that two and two make four. Reason and justice are foundations sufficient for both a religion and a state. Neither needs for practical working purposes all the paraphernalia they now carry with them. We may blunder in arriving at conclusions in the applications of reason and justice, but these conclusions are eternally here waiting for us to solve them.

Ralph Adams Cram, disgusted by the failure of our democracy, our chase for dollars, our overgrown cities and our undergrown souls, advocates in his books, "Walled Towns" and "Toward the Great Peace," a return to the walled cities of the middle ages. Within these cities he would have groups of families, presumably of the same race and the same ideals in religion and philosophy; groups large enough to provide for themselves most of the things needed for their well being. Not only is this an avowal of the failure of modern civilization, but a plea for the return to the manner of protection of life and liberty not only of the middle ages but of the ancient world before the advent of Christianity. But history does not teach us that either the ancient or the medieval world escaped the clash of arms, the devastation of marching armies, the blood of battlefields, the horrors of sacked towns with the murder of the innocent and the helpless therein, nor any of the other curses of the selfishness and greed of men. The walls of Jericho fell down, we are told, even at the marching of the invaders brought into the land by the command of their God.

There is a defense overlooked in these times of discussion of a parity of armaments, the reduction of war debts and of reparations. Though most of the men who are called into grave and learned, if tedious, discussion of these matters are professed followers of a man who taught that evil could be overcome not by resistance, but by good will, we never hear this method of warfare seriously advocated except by some wandering fanatic here and there. And the only man who today has shown us the application of this mode of warfare "against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, and against wickedness in high places," is far off across the sea in a land to which we send missionaries. But no prison has been able to confine the soul of this man.

This is the defense:

> Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God that ye may be able to stand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God.

Imagine a man thus accoutered shutting himself up in a walled town and demanding as big a navy and army as any other nation, and as for wearing the armor of the medieval soldier, where would he wear it, beneath or on top of the armor of God?

From time to time in the West we have had men who dreamed of a kingdom of God within us instead of one afar off in the clouds; a dream of the fusing of ethics and politics so that the church is as practical as the state and the state as holy as the church. And to such as regard it a hard and impossible saying, the answer is that it is not so hard and unthinkable as the chaos of bitterness and anguish which has resulted from the divided allegiance under which the world has suffered for countless ages, and which now in the morning of the new century, seems about to crush it.

There is a fashion in some circles to ignore the teachings of our own greatest sage in America, but he had faith and hope, which we need so much today. In his essay on politics he says: "We are yet at the cock crowing and the morning star of our civilization," and that he has talked to at least one man "to whom no weight of adverse experience will ever make it for a moment appear impossible that thousands of human beings might exercise toward each other the grandest and simplest sentiments, as well as a knot of friends or a pair of lovers."

MAY STRANATHAN.

I Met a Stranger

I met a stranger, on a lonely road;
He carried in his hand a grip, a pack
Upon his back; he rested for a spell,
And then dislodged his pack, and sat him down
To talk of weather, crop conditions, and
The dullness of the times, "Stranger," he said,
"We've nearly lost our grip on things that count;
Why should a man be brought to this? And why
Are Christians slow to recognize the truth?
The good old Book says: 'Truth shall make us free,'
But what is truth? Is it the truth that men
Are made to mourn, and beg from door to door,
Because of famine, and the lack of wealth
To help the starving poor to better times?
Nay, brother," he contined, "it is not
The truth, but just a bare-faced lie. The crops
This year are bountiful; and heaps of gold
Are hid in coffers, waiting to be used.
The lazy rich are hoarding up the wealth
They wrung from fellow mortals; and they live
And stuff themselves on viands fit for gods,
Then preach depression, felt all o'er the earth,
As if the Lord had sent it; when they know
That trade is dull because they've robbed the poor,
And forced them out of work, and thus destroyed
The buying power that made them what they are."
And as he lifted pack and grip, as if
About to go, I thought and pondered o'er
The things that he had said, and wondered much
If many knew of such philosophy.

JOHN ROWLAND.

Henri Barbusse

The leader of a great world movement against war has come to America.

During the World War, in the midst of the shrieking of shells, the rattle of machine-guns, and the bursting of bombs, a French poilu in the trenches wrote a tremendous scorching denunciation of war. This was the book called *"Le Feu"* or "Under Fire;" the Journal of a Squad. It presented a terrific picture of soldiers who had given up trying to be themselves, who had given up thinking and become brutes, doing things they did not want to do.

The book was at once denounced by the military authorities who thought it criminal to tell such truths in war time. Yet the book spread like wild fire throughout France, was awarded the Concourt Prize as the best French novel of the year, was translated into more than twenty languages, and achieved a larger circulation than any book of our time.

The author of this book, Henri Barbusse, combined in himself the best traits of two races; the passionate oratory of his French father, and the practical realism of his English mother. He was international not only by his origin, but also in his appeal. Men in all countries felt a kinship with him. No one could have been better suited to lead the struggle against war.

Before the war, Barbusse had been a sensitive writer of the naturalistic school of Zola, about whom he has just written a very interesting book. When the World War came, Barbusse gave up his writing and voluntered as an ordinary soldier in the 231st Regiment of Infantry. The other soldiers, surprised to find this writer joining them voluntarily, soon welcomed him as one of themselves. Three times he fell sick. Three times he was invalided home. Three times he returned to the front. He emerged from the war decorated for bravery, but terribly lacerated in body and soul and filled with a burning desire to carry on to the end an unflinching war against war.

His former companions in arms unanimously elected him president of the so-called ARAC, the Republican Association of Former Combatants, and later, when he had succeeded in affiliating this with organizations of the front rank fighters and war victims of other countries, Barbusse was made head of the International of Ex-Servicemen. During the fifteen years since the Armistice, Henri Barbusse has continued year by year to build up a world-wide movement of international understanding and of opposition to war.

In 1919, the year after the end of the war, he published a novel called *"Clarte"* or "Light" which ends with a magnificent vision in which, after the war is over, the hero imagines universal revolution in the minds of men and the building up of a world republic. In place of Dante's trilogy of the "Divine Comedy," Barbusse has given us in three great novels a study of human tragedy. Starting with his early pre-war novel, *L'Enfer,* which gives us his Inferno, he passes through *"Le Feu"* as through the fires of Purgatory, and finally emerges in *"Clarte"* into a prophetic vision of Paradise.

Adopting the title of the novel, *Clarte,* Barbusse proceeded to found the so-called Clarte Movement, to bring light and clarity into the dark post-war disillusion, and to organize "a league of intellectual solidarity for the international cause." Associated with him in this "fraternal group of free spirits" were other distinguished French writers such as Anatole France, Georges Duhamel, and Jules Romains, English writers such as Thomas Hardy and H. G. Wells, and other intellectuals from other countries. Yet it was not merely an "International of Thought" that was aimed at. Barbusse hoped for cooperation of the intellectuals and the manual laborers.

To promulgate these ideas, a bi-weekly periodical, *Clarte,* was edited by Barbusse for some eight years, after which he started another review of world culture called *Monde.*

Continuing his opposition to military oppression wherever he saw it, Barbusse denounced French militarism in the war against the Riffs in Morocco, showed up in "Hangmen" the White Terror of Fascism in the Balkans, and helped the cause of the Armenians and Georgians in the Caucasus.

Writing books on all these subjects, editing his periodicals, publishing a great number of powerful short stories, Barbusse still had the indefatigable energy to produce in 1925 a vast, comprehensive work in two volumes called *"Les Enchainements"* or "Chains." By imaginations of a human body, he traced the innumerable links in the chains of the exploitation of man through the ages. In this outline of history, Barbusse showed his growing sympathy with the oppressed.

This sympathy with the working class was confirmed by his trip to the Soviet Union in 1927, at the time of the Tenth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution. About this and his subsequent trips to the Land of the Soviets, he wrote in his book, "One Looks at Russia." His recognition of the splendid record of the Soviets in international relations led him to write his glowing preface to the book, "The Soviet Union and Peace."

The growing danger of an attack on this Workers' Republic by the imperialist nations led Barbusse, in conjunction with Heinrich Mann, Theodore Dreiser, Maxim Gorki, Sherwood Anderson, Havelock Ellis, and other leaders of thought throughout the world to call together the World Congress Against War which met at Amsterdam in August, 1932, the most powerful international gathering against war that the world has ever known. In his eloquent address at this Congress, Barbusse emphasized once more the need of a United Front, of a union of the intellectuals with the great working masses who, he declared, are themselves the greatest power for intellectual progress and the only hope for crushing war.

Since Amsterdam a year ago, Barbusse has devoted all the unflinching strength of his emaciated body to carrying on the work of the International Committee for Struggle Against War and has edited the organ of this movement, *The Front Mondial* or *World Front.* To maintain this world front against war, he is prepared to travel to the ends of the earth to keep up that war upon war which he began in the trenches nearly twenty years ago.

During the World War, in contrast to the protest against war that came from the trenches themselves in Barbusse's "Under Fire," there appeared a

very different appeal entitled "Above the Battle." The very title indicates the difference. This was written by Romain Rolland who was then aloof from the conflict, high in the mountains of Switzerland, which was like an island of peace set in the midst of an ocean of war. It was an idealistic appeal to idealists in contrast to Barbusse's realistic appeal to the common man. For many years it seemed as if the movements opposed to war were divided into two groups following these two points of view. Now, however, they have, fortunately, become united. Romain Rolland has joined Henri Barbusse in calling together the World Congress Against War and now generously describes Barbusse as "the greatest visionary in Europe since the War."

H. W. L. DANA.

The Study Table

Recent History

This book* is an amazing piece of work. We have never seen a statement of contemporary history so fair-minded, so sympathetic, and so just. Nothing could be more crowded with prejudice and passion than the panorama of events which has passed over the European scene since the close of the Great War. But the author of these calm, clear pages never for a moment allows himself to be misled. He is seeking simply to state facts, and to interpret them with utter impartiality and thus with full devotion to the truth. The result is a book which is a model of its kind. More than any history of these times which we have seen, it anticipates the judgments of posterity.

In its brevity, the volume represents almost a miracle of concision. Less than 150 pages long, it gives something more than an outline, or "sketch" as the author modestly describes it, of the history of the last fifteen years in Europe. Here is the story of the Russian Revolution, the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations, Lenin and the U. S. S. R., Italy under Mussolini, France, England and Central Europe, the Spanish dictatorship and revolution, the Five Year Plan, "the Breakdown of the Peace," and Germany from the Armistice to the rise of Hitler. A time-chart completes the book. The only thing that is missing is an index. A special introduction written by the author for the American edition contains one paragraph which must be quoted:

> There is no end to the list of disasters which ignorance has engendered in the post-war years; ignorance has taken Germany to be a serpent which, though you break its back, will yet turn to bruise your heel, Russia to be a heathen tribe bent on sacrificing the young men of the world to its Moloch, France an ineffectual Joshua calling on the sun and moon to stand still while he wins his battles for security. If this book serves to discredit any one of these myths its purpose will have been fulfilled.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Daughter of the Caesars†

An eighteenth-century fugue of heights and depths, subdued, ironic, poignant, tremulous—this is Stefan Zweig's newest creation. Sounding the stops of his organ prose in a manner markedly pianissimo, he builds up—with a sardonic undertone appropriate—the mournful melody of Marie Antoinette, like a pathetic theme in its massive accompaniment of harrowing harmonies. So perfect is his evocation that the princess herself trembles faintly through the echoed chords, ever waxing in grandeur of character with each throbbing cadence until, at apotheosis, she envelops all in the panoply of her pristine splendor. A sudden sharp crash of bass—and the vision is shattered: but its after-tones linger on, causing one to loiter over many previous passages. From music to prose, however, we must turn in order to limn any details of this master work, with full realization that such a medium does it only the most imperfect justice.

Exquisite and doll-like daughter of the Caesars, Marie Antoinette Josepha Jeanne, betrothed to a dauphin as stupid as sterile, is wafted by an ill-wind to the French throne: whereupon there begins, ushered in with portentous pageantry and far-off Aeschylean choruses, a reign stranger than even the fantastic pen of Dumas could portray. Commencing with uncrowned nuptials of ominous import, the career of this rococo Queen hurries on its way, as, leading her laggard husband by the hand, she trips merrily down the primrose path leading to the Conciergerie and the guillotine. Strewn with thorny roses at outset, changing soon to bitter brambles, her way swiftly becomes a veritable *Via Dolorosa,* whose stations have become proverbial: the Consummation; Trianon; Maternity; the Diamond Necklace; Count Fersen; the Maenad march to Versailles; Mirabeau; Varennes; the Tenth of August—and the tidal wave of blood that swept this equivocal Queen, together with her sottish spouse, from a throne into oblivion. Under Zweig's masterly touch her lily (moulded by stony soil and watered by tears) comes to fruition—flowers with all its perfections—and, in the fullness of blossom, is granted one merciful moment of magnificence, before extinction.

Space is lacking to dilate on any of the pageant in detail; and, indeed, words almost are lacking to properly describe this symphonic creation: its subtle rhythms, its pictorial decorations, its minute analysis, its purity of flow. Character jewels of great price stream amid its eddying shallows: Louis XV; Dubarry; Maria Theresa; Joseph II; Cardinal Rohan; Cagliostro (faintly flawed); Philipe Egalite; Axel de Fersen; Mirabeau; Danton; Marat; Hebert; Robespierre; Fouquier-Tinville; Madame de Polignac; Louis XVIII; Napoleon. While the Player Queen herself, as perfectly pictured as ever mortal was, slowly dominates the current even in her helpless mediocrity, until, rising from an abyss of infamy, she makes her most glorious gesture to the ages before espousing them at a crimson altar.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

A Book of Worship

Readers of UNITY, being cherishers of the free spirit in religion, will be much interested in this book.* Indeed, we have been waiting an inordinately long time for an adequate array of such material to appear.

*"Europe Since the War," by J. Hampden Jackson. Published by Dutton, New York. $1.50.

†"Marie Antoinette: the Portrait of an Average Woman," by Stefan Zweig. The Viking Press, New York. $3.50.

*"Antiphonal Readings for Free Worship." Arranged by L. Griswold Williams. The Murray Press. Boston. $1.00. Special prices in quantities.

We are still waiting, as the composition, compilation and publication of this type of thing is yet in its pioneer stage. But we can take heart, for here is a splendid piece of work within its limits. Here are one hundred and one selections taken from a wide range of literature, eighty of them being from extra-biblical sources—Carlyle, Emerson, Nietzsche, Ingersoll, Kahlil Gibran, Seneca, Confucius, H. G. Wells, Thomas a Kempis, Havelock Ellis, Zoroaster, et cetera. The antiphonal arrangement is in most cases above criticism; each reading is neither long nor short; and the typography, binding and indexing are praiseworthy. It is a book which future editors cannot ignore.

The chief shortcoming of the volume lies in the fact that Mr. Williams has been a personal selector rather than an impartial editor. The readings are limited definitely to one man's taste and viewpoint. Despite the large variety of sources, there is not much variety in the spiritual message. The message of romantic liberalism predominates. As literature the average of the book is not above mediocre and some of the pieces are positively terrible. For instance, this from Havelock Ellis:

> By a marvelous cosmic incident, our little planet has broken forth into a strange and beautiful efflorescence. We rise from the world on this variegated jet of organic life, to fall back again to our true life, by whatever unknown ways and under whatever changes of form; conscious it may be; but, as before birth, no longer with any life to be conscious of, no longer organic.

Judged from any point of view, this is the bed-rock of atrocity. It is probably the worst in the book; but there is a good deal to keep it company.

HUGH STEVENSON TIGNER

"There Is No Power But of Graft"

A sparkling start of what promises to be a socially significant and delightful series of chapbooks is made by "A Bible Handbook for Young Babbits,"* by Lee Whitford. The lines may be misconstrued by some as shockingly irreverent in their parody of the Ten Commandments, Lord's Prayer, Psalms, and other parts of the Bible, but we are sure the readers of UNITY will find between the lines highly stimulating and refreshing reverence. The irreverence is that of the money-mad world which substitutes *Got* for *God,* worships material success, and in the name of Christ crucifies his real followers. This world that makes its golden rule, as Whitford suggests, "Do others lest others do you!"

The admirable foreword by the editors of the series, Seymour G. Link and Kenneth W. Porter, calls to our attention a compilation issued by the War Department which quotes Holy Scriptures to justify war, reading God's intention for armaments to be *eternal* into the passage, "The eternal God is my refuge, and underneath are the *everlasting arms.*" They point out that Whitford "edits the text to conform to the interpretation that capitalists have themselves tacitly, perhaps blasphemously, read into Christ's message to man." The satirical tone of this brochure may well sting to thought many who confuse religion with respectability and respectability with conventionality and conservatism.

Here are two of the commandments: "Thou shalt not kill . . . overtly; it is sufficient that thou dost impoverish by low pay, high tariffs, and exorbitant rents." "Thou shalt not steal . . . in small sums. It is abominable, and verily it leads to prison." And here is a passage from "Americans, Chapter XIII. . . . "Wealth never faileth; but whether there be social vision, it shall be done away; whether there be prophets of equality, they shall be squelched; whether there be saviors, they shall be crucified." This chapbook should help belie these very words and the laughter it starts rock graft's foundations in antichristian attitudes.

RALPH CHEYNEY.

*Driftwind Chapbook No. 1: "A Bible Handbook for Young Babbits," by Lee Whitford. Published by the Driftwind Press, North Montpelier, Vt. 25c.

A True Poet

This beautifully printed booklet,* headed by an original sketch of the author by the late Kahlil Gibran and by an introduction by the editor of UNITY, presents thirty poems of rare artistry and charm. Mr. Holmes speaks of them in his introduction as characterized by "delicacy of expression, sensitivity of feeling, and serenity of spirit." All are brief in compass, and unpretentious in quality. Mrs. Falconer knows the range of her instrument and does not strain its power. It is this which gives the poems such calm and strong assurance, as well as beauty.

The nature poems are perhaps the most distinctive in the volume. The cover design, by Charles F. Miller, fittingly represents a faun reclining beneath a flowering tree and gazing at the fleecy clouds. Other pieces touch on themes of love and religion. A few personal poems, addressed or dedicated to Sir James Jeans, Kahlil Gibran, Dr. George David Stewart, the late Dr. Norwood, and Mr. Holmes, reveal Mrs. Falconer's capacity for friendship and appreciation.

This book is a worthy achievement. It is the forerunner, we are sure, of others which will rank the author among the authentic minor poets of our day.

X.

*"Another Spring," by Marie Falconer. Published by the author at Port Washington, Long Island, N. Y.

Correspondence

Protection of American Citizens in Germany

Editor of UNITY:

The American Government was organized to insure "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" of its citizens. The American Government has always maintained this sacred obligation at any cost. It may be mentioned that when the English began to impress naturalized American citizens (who were British subjects before the change of status) to British service as sailors, and interfered with American rights to trade, the young Republic of the United States of America, as the last resort, declared war on the mighty British Empire in 1812. Every American citizen should read the state papers of President Madison and note the spirit of Jefferson and Adams regarding American rights. It may also be mentioned that in 1812, America was ready to declare war on France for the same reason: but France gave in and a Franco-American War was averted.

In matters of maintaining American rights in

other parts of the world—Asia, Africa as well as South America—the American Government did not hesitate to use every possible means, including military measures. It is not necessary to cite instances.

During the World War, America was on the verge of war with Britain, because of the latter's interference with rights of American citizens. (This fact is not generally known; but the recently published U. S. Government documents on American Neutrality during the World War discloses it.) Great Britain had to agree with American contentions. America entered the World War against Germany on the ground that Germany not only refused to guarantee American rights (life of American citizens and their rights), but wantonly violated them.

Since the end of the World War, no nation has helped the German people and government to such an extent as America. Those who know anything about the German attitude towards America will testify that the German people and government hate the Americans most because by American help the Allied Powers won the World War, and the hateful Treaty of Versailles was formulated in violation of the Fourteen Points of President Wilson which were the basis for the German surrender to the Allies. German praise of the American people and government is well calculated hypocrisy to get American money to be invested in Germany. (America has more than two billions of dollars in private loans and it is hardly probable that this amount will ever be paid back by the German people. All German parties are agreed about it and Dr. Schacht is carrying out this program by stages of moratoriums, reduction of interest rates, etc.)

The most significant thing about the present situation in Germany (under the Hitler regime) and American rights is this: Continuous violation of American rights by the Nazis and the government of Germany! Dozens of American citizens have been brutally beaten and molested by individual Nazis, and no redress has been secured by the American authorities who have filed mild protests against these outrages.

The London *Times* has recently published the news that Mr. Mowrer, the Berlin representative of the Chicago *Daily News,* was told that the German Government would not be responsible for his safety if he stayed in Germany. Mr. Mowrer was indirectly forced to leave Berlin, because he did not believe in Nazi methods. Since then, and just after the great demonstration of the National Socialist Party at Nurnberg, where Mr. Hitler extolled all acts of terrorism committed by the Nazis, another American student has been beaten by the "Hitler Youth" in Berlin. The following is the report published in the *Times* (London) of Sept. 5, 1933:

> The instructions issued by the deputy leader of the Nazi Party and confirmed by the chief of staff of the uniformed storm battalions that foreigners are not to be molested or violently persuaded to salute Nazi flags have not yet penetrated to the minds of the zealots An American student, Mr. Samuel Brennan Bossard, of Chester, Pa., who arrived in Berlin on August 29, was on August 31 felled to the ground by enthusiastic members of the Hitler Youth because he failed to salute Nazi flags which passed as he waited to cross the road to his hotel. He was also mishandled while on the ground. A policeman refused to take the names of the Nazis, and he reported the matter to the U. S. Consulate-General.

Is the American Government so occupied with its internal affairs that it cannot protect American citizens in Germany? The present American Government may be reminded of the attitude of the late President Taft towards the Tsarist Government which insisted in interfering with the rights of naturalized American citizens visiting Russia.

It may be said that the German Government has full right to exclude undesirable aliens. That may be true; but once an American citizen is allowed to enter Germany, he must be protected by the German Government. No civilized government can overlook its obligations regarding the protection of foreigners. If the American Government can not assure security of American citizens in Germany, the least the American Government can do is to inform American citizens that they should not visit Germany, unless they were willing to bear possible molestation by the Nazis who do not respect individual freedom, freedom of thought or any form of personal liberty. How long will the American Government tolerate the "bullying policy" of the Hitler regime and the Nazis in Germany?

Paris, France. AN AMERICAN CITIZEN.

Government Reforestation Camps

Editor of UNITY:

There was an editorial in UNITY last issue which was unchristianlike, and untrue, and the facts do not sustain your position. It was an editorial attacking the reforestation camps which we know something about here in California. Your authority for your attack was the *Christian Century,** which apparently went off half-cocked. Because some young men broke "camp rules," and disgraced their families and themselves, you repudiate and chastise 1,500 forest camps, housing three hundred thousand young men who were idle, and who were taken off the streets and highways, and given useful work.

Now we know something about these camps in California, for young men have gone from our towns nearby, and they are better off for it, and besides, the money they have earned has enabled their families to pay their bills, and live without charity. Certainly these young men building fire trails, setting out young trees for the use of future generations, etc., are better off physically, morally, and spiritually than idling on the public streets. There will be some bad actors, of course, but the camps, taken as a whole, should not be condemned before they have investigated, and are sure of their facts.

H. L. BAGGERLY.

Los Gatos, California.

*A communication in the *Christian Century* by a competent and trustworthy observer.—Editor.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 86)

the dignity of the Chair. His very presence in the Legislative Assembly of India belied the unfounded charge that Indians are not capable of using Parliamentary institutions.

The last act of Mr. Patel's life was his visit to America. Coming here under extraordinarily adverse circumstances, Mr. Patel made a success of his visit to the New World. In his radio address to the American people over the Columbia network, Mr. Patel pleaded for closer business and commercial relations between India and America. He made friends all over this country for himself and for his country. He noted with satisfaction the increase of Indo-American business

transactions during the last two decades; and he never tired of saying that a free India would mean an incredibly large volume of business for America.

Mr. Patel is gone but his hopes and dreams still live on. B. G. Tilak, Hakim Ajmal Khan, C. R. Das, Lajkat Rai, Mohammed Ali, Motilal Nehru, Sen Gupta, V. J. Patel, all of whom had the pleasure of enjoying his majesty's hospitality behind prison bars—the procession of India's distinguished sons laying down their lives in the service of their Motherland continues.

One anecdote I must relate. At one stage during the second Round Table Conference in London, Mahatma Gandhi's prestige was at its lowest ebb. Every one of us was poignantly bitter about it. One morning, Mr. Patel came to 88 Knightsbridge—Gandhi's office—to see the Mahatma. After some joking remarks were exchanged, Mr. Patel, tears in his eyes, pleaded with Gandhi to bolt the conference and return home. The blow which Gandhi's prestige had suffered, he argued, was a blow at the Congress and at the Indian nation. Gandhi let Patel get it all off his chest, seeming amused rather than upset by Patel's pleading. Impatient at this, Patel thundered: "You are a Saint. You have renounced the world. But don't you ever think of self-respect and honor for yourself and our country?"

Gandhi replied, this time with solemnity: "As to honor for myself, I'm not concerned with it. As to our country's honor, you may be sure it's in safe keeping with the Congress President, your brother Vallabhbhai."

Vithalbhai Patel's last big job was his effort to get American trade to make an agreement with Gandhi's Independence Party.

For months last year, while dying and scarcely able to walk, the grand old man of India toured the United States, broadcasting, lecturing, interviewing bankers and corporation heads like Frank Vanderlip, India House officers and Ford Motor Company officials. His faith in American farsighted commercial understanding of his own country's potentialities continued even after countless failures to see a committee of industrial experts established for the purpose of planning a rational exchange of goods which his study of trade while mayor of Bombay convinced him would increase manifold American exports to India overnight.

He was among the first to see and expose the danger of the Ottawa Conference to American trade abroad. By his conservative, unsentimental explanations he converted numerous American business leaders to the idea that Indian independence would spell more trade rather than less for the U. S. When he finally left America, to die a political refugee from his homeland, he told me at the pier that he continued to pin his faith in the United States as India's logical helpmate in ridding herself of the British yoke.

Mr. V. J. Patel is dead. Long live the ideals for which he lived and died.

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR.

Naming the Baby in Russia

"Look at the new names it has produced!" says a Russian when you ask him what Communism is achieving, and, though he says it jokingly, no one will deny that new names may yet outnumber new babies. As Albert Rhys Williams has written in Asia, there is "Revmar," abbreviation for "World Revolution," there is "Diamata," short for "Dialectics of Materialism"; then "Rem," an acrostic for "Revolution," "Electrification," and "Moscow," and "side by side with the old prewar favorites—Illya, Pavil, Nikolai, and other names of Orthodox saints—the Soviet almanac offers the names of new Revolutionary saints—Spartacus, Marat, Marx, Garibaldi." —*Literary Digest.*

THE MODERN THINKER

A Magazine of Current Thought

Prospects of Materialism...J. B. S. Haldane
Must There Be War?.....Albert Einstein
Science—Aid or Scourge?....Julian Huxley
Machines and the Future....Havelock Ellis

THE MODERN PSYCHOLOGIST

A Magazine of Contemporary Psychology

How to Adjust Your Personality.Alfred Adler
An Analysis of Belligerence..Sigmund Freud
Living in a World of Pictures..Carl G. Jung
Fears and Their Elimination..Smiley Blanton
Left-Handedness in a Right Handed World.....W. Beran Wolfe

THE NEW CURRENT DIGEST

A Resume of the Outstanding Periodical Literature

The Outlook for Education.....H. G. Wells
Reforming the Government...Bernard Shaw
Nature's Storehouse of Health..Helen Keller

KNOWLEDGE

A Magazine of Scientific Progress

The Story of Blood Transfusion—What Makes a Dwarf—The Lowest Living Types of Man—Some Facts About Hypnotism—Where Did Life Originate?—How to Break a Bad Habit.

25c at better newsstands. Send 25c for sample copy or $1.00 for half-year subscription to Modern Scientific Publications, 310 Riverside Drive, New York City.

Name .....

Address .....

The Christian Register

25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

A SYMPOSIUM ON MARXISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Francis B. Henson, executive secretary of the Religion and Labor Foundation.
Henry P. Van Dusen, professor of theology, Union Theological Seminary.
Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy, Washington Square College, New York University.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE SOVIET UNION, by Raymond B. Bragg, secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference.

A SYMPOSIUM ON MENTAL HYGIENE. General introduction by **Richard C. Cabot** of the Harvard Medical School. By **Willard L. Sperry,** of the Harvard Divinity School; **Sydney B. Snow** of the Meadville Theological School; **John Haynes Holmes** of the Community Church, New York City; **Walter Samuel Swisher** of the Church of the Messiah, St. Louis, Mo.; **Horatio W. Dresser** and **John H. Lathrop** of the Church of the Saviour, Brooklyn, N. Y., and **Harriet H. Cooper,** All Souls Church, Lowell, Mass.

A HUMANIST VIEW OF INGERSOLL, by Edwin H. Wilson, minister of the Third Unitarian Church, Chicago, Ill.

CONTEMPORARY THOUGHT AROUND THE WORLD

PAUL TILLICH, by **Harold Buschman,** editor of *The New Humanist.*

JOHN DEWEY, by **M. C. Otto,** professor of philosophy, University of Wisconsin.

ALBERT SCHWEITZER, by **J. S. Bixler,** Bussey professor of theology at Harvard University and a professor of Smith College.

ROY WOOD SELLARS, by **Archie J. Bahm,** teaching fellow in the department of philosophy, University of Michigan.

To new subscribers THE REGISTER is offering 22 issues for $1.00